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1. Who we are

Established in 2007, the Internet Governance Forum Spain is an opened-decentralized space for the debate of public policy issues that promote the sustainability and solidness of the Internet. It is inspired by the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) established by the United Nations Secretary General in 2006. The IGF Spain tries to develop the own Spanish public policies and governance according to our culture and identity and within agreed conventions and international agreements. This forum led by Dr. Jorge Pérez Martínez, provides a platform to encourage discussion among all stakeholders (representatives of civil society, government, social organizations, private sector, academic and technical community) and is meant to give voice to the Spanish society in international fora in the field of internet governance.

Forum financing comes from the contributions for sponsorship and collaboration of private and public entities as Fundación Telefónica, Fundación Vodafone, Orange, Google, Polytechnic University of Madrid (UPM) E.T.S.I. Telecomunicación, and Red.es

2. Organizing Process

The IGF Advisory Group consists of different members representing each interested group, such as the government, private sector and civil society, and of course involving technical and academic communities. The multistakeholder advisory group is chosen by open and participatory elections.

This is decided in a forum organizational meeting, where also takes part the decision of forming the different Committees (Honor, Organizing and Program). It is also constituted the Forum Technical Office, in charge of the FUNDETEL Foundation of the E.S.T.I. Telecomunicación, Polytechnic University of Madrid (UPM). Both the IGF and the Multistakeholder Advisory Group together with the Committees take part in three periodic meetings along the year as in the IGF Spain Annual Meeting.
2.1 Forum Technical Office

The Forum Technical Office has played a fundamental role in the development of the IGF Spain, with all the responsibility of it assumed by D. Jorge Pérez Martínez. In the beginning, the goal was to develop activities of research and dissemination of the learnings about the “Internet governance”. Nowadays we can differentiate several objectives for the technical office:

- Broadening Internet Governance Debate and Participation
- Coordinating the activities that the Multistakeholder Group develops
- Representing IGF Spain in and outside the country

The IGF Spain Technical Office is constituted by:

- Forum Coordinator: Dr. Jorge Emiliano Pérez Martínez
- Technical Director: Dr. Silvia Serrano
- Secretary: Susana Municio
- Contributors and Technical Staff: Juan Antonio Quintana, Zoraida Frías, Carlos González Valderrama

The contact information is:

**IGF Spain Technical Office**

Avda. Complutense 30, Despacho C-431

Telephone number: +34 91 336 73 20

E-Mail: contactoigf@gtic.ssr.upm.es / smunicio@gtic.ssr.upm.es

28040 Madrid
Spain

[www.igfspain.com](http://www.igfspain.com)
2.2 Board of Directors

The Board of Directors was created in 2012 to establish the general objectives of the forum and to make sure they are achieved. For this, the Board of Directors is in charge of electing the Multistakeholder Advisory Group. Taking into account the open nature of the forum and the interest of involving in the project people with a large experience in the sector, the current Board of Directors is composed of:

- Dª. Rosa María Sáenz (Fundación Telefónica)
- D. Francisco Ruiz (Google)
- Dª. Maite Arcos (Fundación Orange)
- D. Santiago Moreno (Fundación Vodafone)
- D. César Miralles (Chief Officer Red.es)
- Dª. Gema Campillos (Ministerio de Industria, Energía y Turismo)
- D. Andreu Vea (Spanish Chapter’s President of the Internet Society ISOC-ES)

2.3 Multistakeholder Advisory Group

The Multistakeholder Advisory Group is completely involved in the decision making process by participating in the periodic meetings. It is formed by several different groups, including governmental, academic and industry representatives, and also NGOs and customers associations. It is a requisite for them to contribute actively with the forum in order to keep being members of the group.

2.4 Working and Debating Groups by specific areas

In addition to the multistakeholder group and the technical office, the IGF Spain is opened
to the collaboration of other individuals that may make relevant contributions. All of them are joined in working groups which will have the control in the specific sessions during the annual conference. Because of this, they will have to work closely and cohesively and all of them will be advised by the technical office.

3. Maintenance of the multistakeholder model

The contents of the events are the result of a study and analysis of the issues currently most interesting in the development of the Internet Governance. All of them will be defined by the technical office of the IGF Spain after taking into account all of the public proposals received during the deadline for suggestions. Each of the selected content will be assigned to a working group, under the direction of a coordinating group responsible for organizing the members thereof for the completion of the assignment.

The debates are hosted by moderator and speakers, though there is no time for speeches neither presentations. The working group establishes the topics, and features the speakers and the moderator to decide what and how the topics will be addressed. It will be always welcomed the audience participation along the whole debate.

The IGF Spain Annual Meeting welcomes different relevant debates in the context of governance. It pursues the following objectives:

- Analysis of the current issues, unifying thoughts and developing proposals to improve the governance framework in Spain, as well as in the implementation of them in the international context, upholding our member’s points.
- Open the debate on those issues that are currently of greatest interest to the various players in the Internet World.
- Submit openly to the society the development of the discussions held each year in the IGF Global Forum.
- Reaching the conclusions and the messages to present to the Spanish society, the stakeholders and other platforms, governance and international institutions.
As a preparing for the event the Organizing committee carries out the following steps:

3.1 Youth involvement

IGF Spain is determined and convinced of the importance of the open participation and transparency. We try to involve the youth Spanish community by spreading, all over the associations of the university and others such as Telecommunications Engineering and Lawyers associations, mails motivating them to participate asking questions and writing little letters to give their voice about the issues under discussion.

3.2 Web and Social Media

To maintain the active role of the forum web page, an active plan of the social network is established and developed. Every relevant news about the internet governance is published on the web page, which is also connected with the Twitter profile, twitting both the link of
the news and our web page link. This way, the participants of the conference will be able to keep up with the news of governance at the same time they can feel closer to the rest of participants.

All the information of the social media is published in the home page of the website, as well as the participants and sponsors, the conference program and enrollment deadline.

4. IGF Spain Past Activities

Since 2008 the IGF Spain has been meeting celebrating the IGF Spain Annual Meeting, with the proposals explained above and growing year by year. Last year the fourth IGF Spain Annual Meeting took place in Zaragoza, during May 29th and 30th, focused on the Latin-American Internet Governance¹.

Six round tables and four conferences took place and were focused in discussing the following issues:

- Internet Governance
- Privacy and Security
- Internet Economy
- Cibersecurity
- Innovation and Entrepreneurship
- Kids and Internet

The event had a considerable remote participation and over 200 experts of the ICT sector took part representing the different stakeholders. The advisory group who took part was formed by 68 participants, divided in different groups of interest: academic, technical community, government, private sector and civil society.

¹ 2014 IGF Spain Annual Meeting Messages in Annex II
5. IGF Spain 2015 Agenda

In 2015 the IGF Spain has the following goals:

- Continue discussing the multistakeholder model
- Improve the activity on social media and the IGF Spain website
- Take part in the national and international events
- Special newsletters publication
- Digital reports of the forums and events in which we take part
- Launch of First Annual Internet Governance Report

We will have two meetings this year, both in Madrid, first one in April and the second one in November.

Also in May, the city of Zaragoza will host the 5th Annual IGF Spain Meeting, just before the EuroDIG 2015 which will take part in Sofía (Bulgaria) the 4th and 5th of June. Later, between the 10th and the 13th of November João Pessoa (Brazil) will host the 10° IGF Internet Governance Forum.

5.1 First Annual Internet Governance Report

In 2015 for the first time the IGF Spain will elaborate an annual report about the Internet Governance in the World and Spain in particular. This report will be focused in the key issues of the internet governance that emerge along the year from both the national and international point of view. It will also try to increase the free participation by containing the different stakeholder’s points of view.

The first IGF Spain Annual Report will include the following chapters:

1. 2014 Stakeholders contribution to the Internet Governance
2. Critical Resources. Principal Internet Governance Advances
3. Regulation and Cybersecurity. Contributions to the Governance Model
4. Privacy and Vigilance debate in 2014
5. Child Online Safety
6. Intellectual Property and Governance
7. Open Internet and Net Neutrality
8. Internet Economy in 2014
9. Innovation and Entrepreneurship during 2014
## Annex I. Multistakeholder Advisory Group

### Academic Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Urueña López</td>
<td>Profesor en la ETSI Industriales, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Moreno Romero</td>
<td>Profesora en la ETSI Industriales, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Olmos Sanz</td>
<td>Investigadora en la Universidad Politécnica de Madrid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ángel García Castillejo</td>
<td>Profesor, Universidad Carlos III, Madrid Espacio Legal Abogados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Miguel Fumero Reverón</td>
<td>Responsable de Comunicación de Center for Open Middleware, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borja Adsuara Valera</td>
<td>Profesor, Abogado y Consultor en estrategia digital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carles Martín Badell</td>
<td>Profesor Asociado de la Universidad Pompeu Fabra. Directora de Tecnonews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo Olier Arenas</td>
<td>Director de la Cátedra de Geoeconomía y estrategia internacional, Universidad CEU. Presidente del Instituto Choiseul España</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorka Orueta Estibariz</td>
<td>Profesor en la Universidad del País Vasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josep Ibáñez Muñoz</td>
<td>Profesor Universidad Pompeu Fabra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Manuel Zafra Díaz</td>
<td>Profesor Universidad Carlos III de Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maialen Garmendia Larrañaga</td>
<td>Directora del Equipo de Investigación EU kids online III, Universidad País Vasco/EuskalHerrikoUnibertsitatea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramón Louzao Pardo</td>
<td>Catedrático de Lengua y Literatura Española de institutos Nacionales de EEMM. Experto Universitario en Internet y sus Aplicaciones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raúl Cabanes Martínez</td>
<td>Profesor Universidad Politécnica de Madrid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Community

Andreu Vèa i Baro  
Presidente ISOC-ES

Alberto Pérez Gómez  
Subdirector de RedIRIS

Carlos E. Jiménez Gómez  
Global Chair de IEEE Computer Society e–Government

Eugenio Fontán Oñate  
Decano–Presidente del Colegio Oficial Ingenieros de Telecomunicación

Eugenio Triana García  
Senior consultant. Founding member of the board of ICANN

Jacinto Canales de Caso  
Presidente del Consejo General de Colegios Profesionales de Ingeniería Informática

Martín Álvarez-Espinar  
Responsable de la oficina de W3C en España

Tomás de Miguel Moro  
Director de Red IRIS

Víctor Castelo Gutiérrez  
Vocal de la Junta Directiva Capítulo español de ISOC España

Government

Alicia Moral Revilla  
Subdirectora General de Política Exterior, MAEC

Belén Núñez–Lagos Bau  
Jefe de servicio de SEUE–MAEC. Dirección general de coordinación de políticas comunes y asuntos generales de la UE

Blanca Cano Sánchez  
Jefa de la Unidad de Apoyo, Ministerio de Justicia

Carlos Guervós Mailllo  
Subdirector General de Propiedad Intelectual en MECD

Carmelo Javier Muñoz Ruiz  
Director del ONTSI

Cesar Miralles Cabrera  
Director General de Red.es

DanielSirera Bellés  
Consejero Coordinador de la comisión de plataformas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre</th>
<th>Cargo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emilio Aced Félez</td>
<td>Jefe de Área. Unidad de apoyo al Director. Agencia de protección de datos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gema María Campillos</td>
<td>Subdirectora General de Servicios de Sociedad de la Información, SETSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis de Eusebio Ramos</td>
<td>Asesor del Director General de la Policía</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Corro Beseler</td>
<td>Director de Gabinete del Secretario, SETSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Luis Rodríguez Álvarez</td>
<td>Director de la Agencia Española de Protección de Datos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth del Campo Becares</td>
<td>Coordinadora del Área de Internacional del Gabinete del Secretario, SETSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Kuchkovsky Jiménez</td>
<td>Ministerio de la Presidencia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Private Sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre</th>
<th>Cargo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Abella García</td>
<td>Socio de Rooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bárbara Navarro</td>
<td>Directora de Relaciones Institucionales de Google</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benigno Lacort</td>
<td>Director General de AMETIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christoph Steck</td>
<td>Director Public Policy &amp; Internet de Telefónica S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Ruíz Antón</td>
<td>Mánager de Relaciones Institucionales de Google en España y Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Peñalva</td>
<td>CEO de Sentisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Leandro Núñez García</td>
<td>Socio AUDENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julián Conthe Gutiérrez</td>
<td>Miembro de la Junta Directiva de ASINYICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maite Arcos Sánchez</td>
<td>Directora de Relaciones Institucionales de Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María Eugenia de Blas Sanz</td>
<td>Secretaría General – Responsabilidad Corporativa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matías González Martín</td>
<td>Head of Regulación de Fundación Vodafone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel Ángel de Bas Sotelo</td>
<td>Socio Director de Gate2G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel Errasti Argal</td>
<td>Presidente de las Asociación Nacional de Empresas de</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Natalia Basterrechea  
Head of Public Policy de Facebook para España y Portugal

Pablo Bello Arrellano  
Secretario General de Ahciet

Paloma Llaneza González  
Abogado, Socia Directora Razona Legaltech

Pedro J. Canut Zazurca  
Director General de ColorIURIS, S.L. entidad prestadora de servicios de certificación

Rosa María Sainz Peña  
Gerente de Proyectos Editoriales y Explotación de Fundación Telefónica

Santiago Moreno Fernández  
Director General de Fundación Vodafone

Sebastián Muriel  
Vicepresidente de Tuenti

Alejandro Perales Albert  
Presidente de la Asociación de Usuarios de la Comunicación

Alfonso Arbaiza  
Director General Fundetec

Francisco Pérez Bes  
Vicepresidente de ENATIC

Jesús Rivero Laguna  
Presidente de Dintel

José Luis Machota Vadillo  
Colaborador IGF

Chimo Soler  
Vocal Junta Directiva ISOC-es.

Martín Pérez  
Presidente de la Fundación España Digital

Miguel Pérez Subías  
Presidente de la Asociación de Usuarios de Internet

Ricard Martínez Martínez  
Presidente Asociación Profesional Española de Privacidad

Víctor Domingo Prieto  
Presidente de la Asociación de Internautas

Yolanda Rueda Fernández  
Presidenta de Cibervoluntarios
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The year 2014 has certainly been very intense for Internet Governance discussions. The annual meeting of the Spanish Internet Governance Forum took place on 29th and 30th May 2014 in the city of Zaragoza. It featured six panels besides the participation of prominent speakers at the international level, which helped revitalize the debate. Below are reflected messages Governance Forum Internet in Spain 2014, as a summary of each of the topics for discussion.

*Internet Governance: Internet Governance after NETMundial meeting*

Last Spanish Internet Governance Forum 2013 emerged consensus on the failure of the World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT), which had taken place December 2012 in Dubai. In contrast, during the Spanish 2014 IGF the Panel on Internet Governance agreed to give a positive assessment to NETmundial, the Global Multistakeholder Meeting on the Future of Internet Governance held one month ago in Brazil.

The speakers of this Panel believe that NETmundial was a positive experience and has made a niche for itself in the scheme of places for debate on Internet Governance, among others, thanks to the generation of a document, the "Multistakeholder Declaration of Sao Paulo", which includes Fundamental Principles and a Roadmap for the future of Internet governance. Part of the success of NETmundial was due to the previous work carried out by the Executive Committee and the High-Level Committee, since they prepared a working document from the submitted contributions. In addition, NETmundial can be considered a big success by the impact and great participation achieved, involving all stakeholders and a large number of countries, including developing countries which had not always been previously represented at this kind of events. This multistakeholder participation, the impact and the output document provide certain legitimacy by itself to NETmundial, despite the Declaration being non-binding.

NETmundial was a real example of multistakeholdersim, which may be replicated in other countries in the future. It is a new model that needs time to consolidate and, in particular, there are two points that needs to be further improved: on the one hand, the role of the different stakeholders, which must be clarified and turns into a challenge being respected in their respective roles; on the other hand, it is important to continue giving opportunities to all stakeholders to participate.

NETmundial was important in order to start addressing the problem of restoring trust in the Network. Nonetheless, among the members of the panel, there was no consensus on the relevance that this aspect had, neither on the issue of net neutrality.
The Internet Principles contained in the Declaration are very strong and could be extrapolated to a national basis. The importance of these principles is probably that cannot be valued until later as it happened with the case of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The roadmap, on the contrary, got less visible results. In general, the speakers of the panel agreed that they would have wished that more actions had been specified to be carried out in the upcoming months, especially on the issues of globalization and internationalization of critical resources. It was pointed out also the strength timeline there is for the implementation of some issues, just until September 2015. We have to be aware that both the transition of the IANA functions and the improvement the accountability of ICANN are not easy processes, and it will involve a big effort for everyone, especially for governments, for whom reaching consensus is difficult. The Brazilian Internet Bill of Rights (Marco Civil) was pointed out to serve as reference for other legislations at European level or for international treaties.

Finally, there were very different views on the panel about which should be the next steps. On the one hand, NETmundial could be the beginning for the creation and consolidation of an international law multistakeholder institution, similar to the United Nations Organization, where all countries address in a coordinated manner Internet governance issues. The idea would be to replicate already existing legal schemes, as those serving for international maritime law, which tries to give a solution to the problems that occur in areas where there is no defined sovereignty. This replica would stick to the Internet “social” Internet, since “physical” layer (infrastructure, investment...) and “virtual” layer (application, security...) work reasonably well.

The need to maintain discussion forums without specific results with more flexible structures was also acknowledge, such as the IGF, to move the debate on this Internet governance issues forward, and even look for new smaller and more structured spaces.

**Children and the Internet**

As enshrined in Article 25 of the Universal Declaration: children "are entitled to special care and assistance". As enshrined in Article 5 of the United Nation Convention on the Rights of the Child, youth are entitled to be respected for their "development stage".

In Internet terms, this means that children should be free to use and exploit all the advantages and benefits that the Internet provides to develop as individuals, while they must be protected from the dangers associated with the Internet.

The balance between these priorities will depend on the skills of young people, on their environment (especially their parents and educators) know-how and on the technical tools that Governments and businesses make available to each other. On the Internet, the right to special care and assistance and respect for the capacity building of children include:
a) Right to benefit from the Internet and new technologies

Children should be able to benefit from Internet according to their age. Boys and girls should have the opportunity to use the Internet to exercise their civil, political, economic, cultural and social rights.

In this sense we have pointed out the difference between the perception of the average adult, more negative, compared to the minors, who are positive.

In terms of privacy abuses also occur in especial in new mobile applications that in some cases collect all the personal data of the mobile device without these being necessary for the application that is offered.

Another important aspect is what children use technology for. They spend much of their time in the Internet to communication tasks and entertainment at the expense of more creative and formative tasks that parents and trainers would like.

b) Protection against exploitation and child abuse images

Children are entitled to grow and develop in a safe environment, free from any kind of exploitation, including sexual exploitation. Thus, measures must be taken to prevent the use of the Internet to violate children’s rights, including child abuse images.

However, such measures should have a specific and proportionate purpose. The impact of the measured on the free flow of information should be considered, especially taken into account that this kind of abuses is low: below 1% of crimes involving minors are related to Internet.

c) Right to be heard

Children, who are capable of forming their own views, have right to express themselves on the Internet on all policy matters affecting them and their views will be duly taken into account according to their age and maturity.

In this sense, the forum has highlighted the difficulty of establishing channels to give a voice for children so that they can be heard by those who have responsibility to educate, legislate or create new applications.

d) The prevailing interests of the child

As enshrined in Article 3 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child: "In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or bodies legislation, a primary consideration is that they will serve the interests of the child".

Article 13 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child states that "The child has the right to freedom of expression, which includes freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kind". However, not everyone shares this principle in the same way. Many parents, schools and organizations believe that it is better to block access by minors to certain content and applications to protect against certain risks.
We also find rules and laws that protect minors on the Internet that are impossible to implement and this at a time when children live with screens and smartphones increasingly powerful, at increasingly earlier ages and with heavy use that already exceeds 6 hours a day in front of a screen. Opportunities coexist with a large number of risks.

In this regard noted the need to modify the existing legal framework to adapt to the reality imposed by the Internet and the applications and tools that use the Internet are increasingly adapted to the uses made of the network.

_Privacy and surveillance: Restoring confidence in the Net_

- There is a gap between the legal regulation of privacy and the current situation, needs and concept of privacy for the citizens, who have largely given it up in the current knowledge-based society. In this regard, we should further work on improving the citizens’ building, so they know how to manage their privacy on the Internet.

- On the other hand, there is a lack of trust in the Network derived from factors such as the non-transparent processing of personal data, big data, cybercrime, security problems (loss, theft of data to big Internet players) or what is called “Snowden effect”. Thus, it would be convenient to improve transparency, to go on working on “privacy by design” and to provide solutions such as privacy impact assessments.

- The current legislation is not satisfactory, from the private sector point of view, because of the restricted conception of privacy and the lack of adaptation and social and technological adequacy (among others, the evolution of online advertising). It was suggested that privacy should have a social dimension and, in some cases, we could find harmless uses of foreign data that legislation should take into account. Some concepts (appropriate or relevant data, or the situations that have the consideration of data treatment) are oversized, which leads to a situation where reasonable actions constitute infringement.

- The private sector criticized the deficient legislative technique, since the legal framework is cumbersome and excessive, which leads to a great legal uncertainty and involves some problems for European companies’ competitiveness environment against other countries with looser regulations (such as the US), which leads to ask for lower demands and a take an approach closer to the industry interests, also looking for a global regulatory framework in line with the so-called third generation rights.

- In contrast, the National Data Protection Agency representative reminds that both the legal framework and the own doctrine of the Court of Justice of the European Communities establish that the right to privacy has range of fundamental right and, in this sense, it should not relativized, but we must be consequent with the degree of protection that has been recognized.

- The regulation of the cookies was especially discussed, both its suitability and the solution adopted, being referred to as a formalism, which actually does not protect the citizen, who gives his consent not being aware of the scope of the treatment involved. This all can be due to the lack of privacy building and knowledge by the user.

- Regarding the recent judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Communities in the case against Google, it is stood out in particular the problems of its practical application, especially when weighting the so-called “right to be forgotten” and the
freedom of expression or the right to information. A question arose in regard to the existence or not of objective criteria for this weighting. On the other hand, it was pointed out that if the criterion whereby undertakes to submit Google to European legislation in this case is actually according to the legal framework, or if it is rather forced, and in this sense the criteria should be established according to consumers’ rights. In any case, the representative of the Spanish Data Protection Agency gave a positive assessment to the result, which improves trust on the Network and recognizes that users have control of their own data on the Internet.

Internet Economy: Challenges for Spain

Internet economy is nowadays the fastest growing sector in the world, and there is no doubt about the pull effect of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) over the entire global economy. At our panel session we wanted to explore proposals and measures so that the Spanish economy as a whole could benefit from its potential.

The Public Administration is working on the regulation and promotion of ICTs because of its capacity to transform other industries. We cannot stop working on network deployment and in citizens’ building. New opportunities are identified, especially for entrepreneurs, such as a progressive personalization of services and products or the exploitation and use of public databases to create new digital content developing innovative ways to present, relate or consume those contents.

Intellectual property, privacy and telecommunication regulation have been highlighted for its capacity to determine the context in which the industry evolves and new services are developed. We are obliged to think about social and cultural changes that affect the way we consume contents and the new business models that drive the industry. There is a kind of "all for free" culture that forces companies to think about new business models, including the controversial exploration of the user’s personal data utility for the business community. Privacy protection, a breakthrough for citizens, also involves additional obstacles for the development of business models, so companies begin to seek arbitration opportunities being geographically located in those places most advantageous, as happens in a similar way, for example, when making decisions based on different national taxes.

Technology and business are moving forward at a frenetic pace and the established structures are struggling to adapt themselves to this situation. From the point of view of traditional economy stakeholders we observe with amazement the emergence of collaborative models and financial structures on which new business models depend to obtain funding; investment in entrepreneurial projects involves great challenges due to the difficulty in assessing unknown and untested business models.

We also endeavor to adapt in both social and professional aspects. A growing number of studies show the correlation between innovation and job creation. We are convinced that we
want to build a good entrepreneurial ecosystem, to promote public-private partnerships to lead strategic changes in the country and to empower our citizens.

It is important to believe in the relevance of creating value and wealth, as well as to find ways that business success reverses in society. To promote entrepreneurial culture we must think about transversal competences and great agility in the training of professionals. We are getting used to the fact that experts in new professions (think about SEO experts, for example) are urgently needed

**Cybersecurity: Challenges of cybersecurity to Internet governance**

The panel on cybersecurity initially posed a question to all the speakers: has cybersecurity become a new challenge for those players involved in Internet governance? Do strategies and policies in the field of cybersecurity, both national and global, as well as the measures adopted by the main players on the Internet, require the review of some of the principles, rules, procedures and common programs widely accepted on the Internet governance?

The answer is not simple. The evolution of threats, its global impact and the effects produced on users’ trust are worrying and deserve special attention. In general, it is positively perceived that governments have taken part and defined strategies and policies to address this challenge. Nevertheless, we should take into account the need to preserve the necessary balance between all parties involved based on generally accepted principles, especially on issues of national security, public safety and national defense.

The “wild west” of the Internet requires action by all stakeholders involved. The responsibility of each party has been considered essential to face the challenge. Awareness about the implications and effects to third parties that may cause an uninformed, irresponsible or negative attitude is a complex task that requires the contribution from all stakeholder to build, train and raise awareness. The adoption of Internet security and compliance standards is necessary, as they have been the road safety regulations for the safe use of roads, driving and safety of travelers. The role of international treaties has been acknowledged to be very important, but the difficulty of its adoption by the different cultures of safety that each country defends, among others, should also be noted.

Regarding the future, the panel outlined its concerns. Firstly, the need to evolve towards a concept of security focused on risk management, thus avoiding paralysis and the loss of opportunities for innovation economy and society development. This risk management-based model arises as opposed to the classical restrictive view, based on the protection of information assets. This vision of risk management is still the basis for the OECD information safety principles reform and the world’s major economies. Security is a catalyst for the economy which requires adaptive intelligent and proportionate management; we cannot build a barrier for the future out of it.

Secondly, the worrying technological dependence that economies and societies have today. The Internet makes us vulnerable while gives us new opportunities. Its quick development as well as its rapid adoption by enterprises and citizens should lead to a reflexion. Are we repeating past mistakes? Internet was born with no security design and now we are suffering
the consequences. Are we ensuring the sustainable development of future technologies from security perspective? In a world of interaction between machines, should security and privacy by design not be an exclusive requirement? It seems that we can be repeating the same mistakes of the past. Who will be responsible for threats of cybersecurity that will face the next generations?

**Internet Entrepreneurship: Technology and people**

The debate was developed along two different axes: technology and people, with experiences based on open innovation and prototyping culture, such as those represented in the panel by Zaragoza Urban Lab Open or the crowdfunding platform goteo.org, which contributed the fundamental dimension of "social innovation", regarding smart cities and building an open ecosystem for business financing, respectively.

"Entrepreneurship is something bigger than an emergency exit," said Marta de Miguel; and that is beyond self-employment as a response to certain socio-economic circumstances. We need to build an "innovative, entrepreneurial" attitude at all levels, in either social or institutional aspects. "Reinventing to perform" as a belief, in words of Jaime Estevez, CEO and founder of Agora News.

The Spanish university, whose social perception has recently decreased and whose capacity to build students on this issues has been questioned, is making though big efforts to promote initiatives, such as ActúaUPM, which has fostered the creation of 155 companies, gained over M€ 33 or evaluated more than 2,500 business ideas, since it was launched, ten years ago.

Out of the three basic pillars which allow entrepreneurial activity - innovation, investment and internationalization- the second one seems to be the most critical when it comes to develop real entrepreneurial ecosystem in our country.

Beyond the topics related to business failure or early innovation, the lack of a business culture show that “there is still much to do in Spain”, which Aristides Senra pointed out. “Local entrepreneurship, global innovation” can summarize on the one hand the relevance of internationalization of a business accelerated by the current “socio-technical” environment; and on the other side, the need of considering the importance on where innovation takes place.

These two aspects are combined in the debate: highlighting the need to learn how to "start a business with others" and to "collaborate to better compete". As a main conclusion we can say that if we go beyond the "simple", simplistic, technological innovation and build full social innovation is necessary to provide organizational, individual and technical issues in complex interrelationship.

Recognizing that everything has to be done, it is possible to affirm that this is one of the most promising sectors of activity, as well as the one most representative of a socioeconomic reality that must start from the conviction that entrepreneurship is much more than "an emergency exit."